

Two examples bred from larvæ in stem of *Artemisia* and another labelled "bred probably from oak," but I think this is a mistake. I have the species also from Las Vegas, New Mexico, May 5 and June 6 (T. D. A. Cockerell) and Wilgus, Cochise Co., Arizona (Dr. Barnes).

Phalonia unistrigana, n. sp.

Wings elongate and rounded, palpi short. Ground color white, overwashed on the fore wings irregularly with faint ochereous, the white remaining in patches in and below cell, on internal margin and in a transverse band at outer third of wing. A narrow, broken, oblique black-brown line, directed from middle of inner margin to outer third of costa, not reaching inner margin, broken centrally, the lower part forming a rounded bar, the upper part more diffuse; a series of diffuse, irregular, dark dots in apical portion, in some specimens confined to apical margin, in others spread as far as tornus and situated on white ground color. Hind wing dark gray, fringe paler except at anal angle. Expanse, 18-22 mm.

Three ♀♀, June 9. Also a male from Flagstaff, Arizona. (Schwarz and Barber.)

Type.—No. 6741, U. S. National Museum.

Besides the species listed above, there are eight other species of Pyralids, mostly Phycitinæ, and all but one females. Their position can therefore not be determined and they will have to await mates before being described. One of them is very strikingly marked.

The paper was discussed by Messrs. Howard and Ashmead. Mr. Ashmead mentioned a new and curious Mutillid collected by Messrs. Schwarz and Barber in Arizona. He said that special efforts should be made to collect wingless females of Mutillidæ in association with the males, as it was almost impossible to determine them when taken singly.

—The following paper by Mr. Caudell was read by the Recording Secretary:

NOTES ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF BLATTIDÆ.

By A. N. CAUDELL.

During the past year two attempts have been made to determine the type species of the Linnæan genus *Blatta*. In Entomological News, Volume xiii, page 101, Mr. James A. G. Rehn applied the process of elimination to the problem, only non-exotic species being considered in accordance with Canon xxiii of the

A. O. U. Code. He arrived at the conclusion that *Blatta orientalis* Linnæus is the type of the genus. But unfortunately the author gives in his table of elimination the date of the removal of *orientalis* from the genus *Blatta* as 1846, when in fact it was placed in the genus *Steleopyga* by Fischer in 1833,* and four years previous to that date into the genus *Kakerlac* by Latreille.† The only other non-exotic species, *lapponica*, was removed from *Blatta* to *Ectobius* by Westwood in 1835.‡ Thus, of the non-exotic species, *lapponica* was last removed and is, therefore, the type of *Blatta* as determined by the method of elimination when properly applied to the non-exotic species only.

Dr. Krauss, in his recent most valuable communication on the nomenclature of the Orthoptera,§ also applies the method of elimination, but, unlike Rehn, considers all the species originally included under the genus, both exotic and non-exotic. By this means he shows *surinamensis* to be the last removed, except *nivea*, which was simultaneously removed, both being included in Burmeister's genus *Panchlora*. Later, 1865,|| Brunner removed *surinamensis* to his new subgenus *Leucophæa*. This, reasons Dr. Krauss, makes *Leucophæa* and *Blatta* synonymous, each having *surinamensis* as the type species.

Both of the above attempts at fixing the type of this genus, no matter how well done or how satisfactory the results may be to the respective authors, are, in the writer's opinion, wholly unnecessary and fruitless. As a matter of fact the type of *Blatta* was clearly designated many years ago. In 1807¶ Latreille included *orientalis* alone under the genus, and on this fact Dr. Krauss bases the statement that *orientalis* was described as typical at that date. But five years prior to that date** Latreille specified *orientalis* as the example (example here obviously used in the sense of type) of the genus *Blatta*. Then, in 1810†† the same author definitely designates *orientalis* as the type of *Blatta*, here using the word type. Now this author, writing as he did at a time before any of the original species had been removed from the genus, certainly had the right to designate which of them should constitute the generic type. A valid, non-exotic species, and one originally placed in the genus, having been specifically designated as the type, should never be changed, even by the one so designating it. Otherwise there can obviously never be a sta-

* Bull. Soc. Nat. Mosc., vi, p. 366.

† Cuvier's Règne Animal, V (Ins. ii), p. 175. 1829.

‡ Stephen's Illustrations of British Entomology, Mandibulata, vi, p. 45.

§ Zoologischen Anzeiger, xxx, p. 530, Aug., 1902.

|| Nouveau Système des Blattaires, p. 278.

¶ Genera Crustaceorum et Insectorum, iii, p. 83.

** Histoire Naturelle, iii, p. 269, 1802.

†† Consid. Crust. Arachn. et Insectes, p. 433.

ble nomenclature. Thus *orientalis* is the type of the genus *Blatta*.

Mr. D. W. Coquillett has recently called my attention to the fact that the dipterous genus *Phyllodromia* of Zetterstedt was described in 1837,* and not, as recorded by Agassiz and Scudder, in 1842. The orthopterous genus *Phyllodromia*, being thus preoccupied in the Diptera, must necessarily fall. Being a valid genus, of which *Blatta germanica* Linnæus is the type and having no synonyms, a new name is unavoidable. The generic name *Blattella* is here proposed for it.

Dr. Gill said that he upheld the conclusions Mr. Caudell had drawn in his paper.

Dr. Howard said that in his opinion there is a distinct ethical question involved in the proposal of new generic names to take the place of those preoccupied. While it is true that any one who makes the discovery of preoccupation has a right to propose a new name, and probably a moral right, he considers such action discourteous to the author if the author be still living and engaged in active work, and also discourteous to specialists in the group involved if the person making the change is not himself a specialist in the same group. As an example, he would not himself think of proposing a new name in the Lepidoptera unless he had previously notified the author of the name of the fact of preoccupation, and had indicated to him the desirability that he should himself propose a new name. Failing that, he would not propose a new name unless he had notified some other well-known worker in Lepidoptera of the preoccupation and had suggested that he propose a new name. In other words, in his opinion it is bad form for a man who is not a specialist in a group to propose a generic name in that group.

Mr. Ashmead agreed with Dr. Howard's views and spoke further in criticism of the extensive proposing of new specific names, as in Dalla Torre's Catalogue, in consequence of homonymy within the genus. He thought the uniting of so many genera not justified and that the new names would have to be rejected.

Dr. Dyar thought that personal considerations should not

* Isis, p. 31.